

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1,3-11 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishikawa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,639,699). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS 1 AND 13

First, please note that the dielectric resonator of the instant invention employs a ceramic material. In other words, there is no assumption of materials other than the ceramic. The Examiner correctly pointed out that the Nishikawa case is filled with air-which the Examiner construed as a dielectric material. Even using the ceramic material, Applicants have confirmed that TM_{010} mode is available. In order to clarify the difference between the instant invention and Nishikawa (USP No. 4,639,699), Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Since the ceramic material has high dielectric constant, low dielectric loss, and desired temperature characteristics, the resonator in the present configuration presents the superior characteristics. In comparison with Nishikawa's configuration in which space is partially provided (see Fig. 15), the instant invention can be simply fabricated. Moreover, the instant invention provides the following effect: much downsizing is realized since the resonator is filled with the ceramic material, and thereby the loss of

the whole circuit is reduced due to short wirings for connecting to the other circuit elements.

WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS 6-9 AND 11

In Nishikawa, an elastic layer is sandwiched between a sheet 70 and a case 81, however Fig. 32 does not illustrate whether the sheet is in contact with the case or not. On the other hand, Claim 6 recites that the side wall of the case body 32 is in electrically contact with the conductive foil 35 so as to prevent the loss of the resonator (see Fig. 7). The support for the amendment to Claims 6 and 11 is found on page 27, lines 8-9 of the specification.

Specifically, in the claimed resonator, the conductive foil extends outwardly to the outer of the case so that electrical contact between the case body and the conductive foil can be easily obtained by tightening with the bolt. In the TM mode, the electrical contact failure between each portion of the case causes to increase the loss of the resonator. However, the resonator of the present invention provides a high Q value, and at the same time, both ends of the dielectric are in close contact with the bottom of the case body and the conductive foil so as to be fixed easily.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: SEPT. 26, 2003

By: 
Timothy D. MacIntyre
Reg. No. 42,824

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/kk